REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pending claims 1, 2 and 4-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,793,989 (Moss). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration of the same. As to claim 1, Moss nowhere teaches: (1) a common set of pins coupled to first and second interface circuits and a host computer bus; (2) such common set of pins communicating with the host computer bus in accordance with either a first or second bus standard; or (3) the common set of pins being user selectable.

As to point (1), the Office Action contends that the common set of pins is taught by Moss as element 105, which Moss teaches is a female mechanical connector. However, this connector is not coupled to both multiple interface circuits and a host computer bus. Instead, Moss teaches that the connector 105 is connected to a card logic unit 111 and a corresponding mechanical connector 107 of an applications device 103. Clearly, card logic unit 111 is not multiple interface circuits. Instead the Office Action concedes that these circuits are met by interface logics 112 and 113 of Moss. Nor is applications device 103 a computer bus. Thus Moss fails to teach a common set of pins coupled to both first and second interface circuits and a host computer bus.

Furthermore, nowhere does Moss teach that such (non-existent) common pins communicate with the host computer bus in accordance with either of the first or second bus standards. In fact, Moss teaches the opposite. That is, in Moss only RS-232 signals are communicated with I/O bus 127 (contended by the Office Action to be the computer bus).

The Office Action further contends that the common set of pins of Moss is user selectable "because the user ultimately in the end selects the pin format." Office Action, p. 3. It is unclear what the Office Action is referring to in this regard, as there is no support in Moss for such "ultimate user selection." That is, in Moss there is no mention of a user, nor that the user makes a selection of a bus standard with which common pins communicate with a host computer bus. As described above, there is no communication with a host computer bus in Moss in accordance with multiple bus standards. Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Moss.

As to dependent claim 5, Moss nowhere teaches a multi-voltage I/O buffer coupled to each pin. Instead, the Office Action merely refers to tri-state buffers that act as multiplexing switches within card logic unit 111. Such multiplexing switches are not multi-voltage I/O

buffers. As to dependent claim 6, Moss nowhere teaches an internal bus coupled to both first and second interface circuits. In this regard, the Office Action refers to items 114, 115, 116 and 119 of Moss. However, as clearly shown in Moss each of these buses are independent buses and no one of these buses couples to both interface circuits. Moss, FIG. 2. Accordingly, dependent claims 5 and 6 are patentable for these further reasons.

For at least the same reasons as claim 1, the rejection of dependent claim 3 under §103(a) over Moss in view of Tyson "How PCI Works" is similarly overcome.

As to dependent claims 7 and 8, which stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Moss alone, this rejection is overcome at least for the same reasons discussed above regarding claims 1 and 6. The rejection is further improper, as there is no teaching or suggestion in Moss for an interface circuit that formats signals on an internal bus that is coupled to both interface circuits. Instead, as described above in Moss, dedicated buses exist, namely dedicated buses 114 and 116 and dedicated buses 115 and 119, each of which provides signals of only a single bus standard to the interface circuits.

For at least the same reasons described above as to claim 1, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under §103(a) over Moss in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,871,244 (Cahill) is similarly overcome.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 14, 2006

Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, Texas 77057-2631
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]
Customer No.: 21906